

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13, 15-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolossow together with Muruta and further view of Capelle. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner characterizes Capelle as having a screw portion in section 8 increasing in size from section 7 and then thereafter reducing towards its front end in section 10. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Capelle and reliance on Capelle in rejection applicant's claims. As previously presented, claim 1 required that the extrusion screw have a diffusion screw part on a downstream end thereof. Claim 1 also required that at least at the downstream end of the diffusion screw part, a diameter reducing part is provided having a lead extending therealong. Thus, claim 1 provided that the diffusion screw part is at a downstream end of the extrusion screw and further that at the downstream end of the diffusion screw part, there is the diameter reducing part having a lead thereon.

Capelle discloses an enlarged diameter portion in section 8, a diameter reducing portion at the final third of section 8 and then a constant diameter portion in section 10 which is the same diameter as the upstream portion of the screw. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's characterization, Capelle does not provide at a downstream end thereof a diameter educing portion having a lead. At the downstream end there is only a constant diameter portion, the diameter reducing portion (the tapered part) being provided upstream of the downstream end, in section 8.

To avoid any mischaracterization of the "diameter reducing part" of claim 1, claim 1 has been amended above to clarify that the diameter reducing part is tapered

YAMAGUCHI et al  
Appl. No. 10/669,599  
March 2, 2006


so that its diameter reduces to its downstream end. Capelle clearly does not teach that section 10 is tapered and has a lead extending along the taper. Thus, even if Capelle could be combined with the Examiner's primary and secondary references, the invention of claim 1 would still not be anticipated by nor obvious.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on Kolossow, Murata and Capelle is respectfully requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: 

Michelle N. Lester  
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100